

1 TONY WEST  
Assistant Attorney General  
2 JOSEPH H. HUNT  
VINCENT M. GARVEY  
3 JEFFREY M. SMITH  
Department of Justice, Civil Division  
4 Federal Programs Branch  
20 Massachusetts Ave. N.W.  
5 Washington, D.C. 20001  
6 Telephone: (202) 514-5751  
Fax: (202) 616-8202  
7

8 *Counsel for the United States of America*

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 IN RE TRANSPACIFIC PASSENGER  
12 AIR TRANSPORTATION  
13 ANTITRUST  
LITIGATION

File No. 3:07-cv-05634-CRB

MDL No. 1913

14 This Document Relates to:  
15 ALL ACTIONS  
16

**STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

17 The United States provides this Statement in response to the Court's letter dated  
18 December 14, 2010 to the State Department Legal Adviser and pursuant to the United States'  
19 statutory authority set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 517.<sup>1</sup> The United States appreciates the  
20 opportunity to provide its views on this matter.

21 The Supreme Court has described the requirements of the act of state doctrine. The  
22 act of state doctrine applies to require dismissal of a case when a court in the United States  
23 would be required "to declare invalid the official act of a foreign sovereign performed within  
24 its own territory." *Environmental Tectonics v. Kirkpatrick*, 493 U.S. 400, 405 (1990). As the  
25 Supreme Court stated in *Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino*, 376 U.S. 398, 428 (1964),  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 517 provides that: "The Solicitor General, or any officer of the Department of  
28 Justice, may be sent by the Attorney General to any State or district in the United States to attend to the  
interests of the United States in a suit pending in a court of the United States, or in a court of a State, or  
to attend to any other interest of the United States."

1 “rather than laying down or reaffirming an inflexible and all-encompassing rule in this case,  
 2 we decide only that the (Judicial Branch) will not examine the validity of a [sovereign action]  
 3 . . . within its own territory by a foreign sovereign government . . . in the absence of a treaty  
 4 or other unambiguous agreement regarding controlling legal principles . . . .” Exceptions to  
 5 the doctrine may apply in some contexts. The application of these principles in any given  
 6 case will turn on the elements of particular claims and defenses at issue as well as the  
 7 particular factual findings of the court. At present, the United States is not in a position to  
 8 express its views on whether a ruling in this matter would implicate the act of state doctrine.

9 Fact-finding by a court may cast light on whether the prerequisites of the act of state  
 10 doctrine are present (e.g., whether the court must decide the validity of an official act,  
 11 whether the relevant acts taken are “sovereign” acts, and whether the territorial requirements  
 12 are met) and whether any exceptions to the act of state doctrine apply.

13 The United States appreciates the Court’s consideration and its invitation to submit  
 14 views in this matter.

15  
 16 January 21, 2011

17 Of Counsel:

18 HAROLD HONGJU KOH  
 19 Legal Adviser  
 United States Department of State

Respectfully submitted,

TONY WEST  
 Assistant Attorney General

JOSEPH H. HUNT  
 Branch Director

VINCENT M. GARVEY  
 Deputy Branch Director

22 /s/ Jeffrey M. Smith

23 JEFFREY M. SMITH  
 24 U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division  
 20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
 Room 7144  
 Washington, D.C. 20001  
 Tel: (202) 514-4775  
 Fax: (202) 616-8470

27 *Attorneys for the United States of America*